

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

United States of America

v.

Gordon J. Coburn and Steven
Schwartz,

Defendants.

Criminal No. 19-120 (MEF)

ORDER

In their June 12 letter, the Defendants argue that a Rule 17 subpoena should still issue as to Cognizant, even after the Court's Pune-related ruling. Maybe yes, maybe no. But one way or another, the Court's preliminary assessment is that the subpoena now proposed by the Defendants appears to be much broader than the current justifications they offer for it. The Court will hold in abeyance its ruling on the pending request for a Rule 17 subpoena. In the interim, the Defendants may file a much-pared back subpoena, should they wish to, on or before June 28. If the Defendants avail themselves of this option, they and Cognizant shall file a brief joint letter on or before June 28 explaining the steps they have taken to come to agreement on a narrowed subpoena, and why those steps have not produced agreement. The letter shall be no more than two single-spaced pages. If the letter is proposed to be filed on an ex parte and/or in camera basis, a supplemental letter of no more than one page shall be filed on or before June 28 that explains the legal basis for proceeding that way.

IT IS on this 21st day of June, 2024, so **ORDERED**.



Michael E. Farbiarz, U.S.D.J.